DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 281 240 CS 210 477

AUTHOR Grunig, Larissa Schneider
TITLE Shattering the "Glass Ceiling" in Journalism Education: Sex Discrimination in Promotion and Tenure.
PUB DATE Aug 87
NOTE 39p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (70th, San Antonio, TX, August 1-4, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS College Faculty; Employer Employee Relationship; Equal Opportunities (Jobs); Faculty College Relationship; Faculty Evaluation; *Faculty Promotion; Higher Education; Job Satisfaction; *Journalism Education; *Sex Discrimination; Tenured Faculty; *Women Faculty

ABSTRACT

An informal study examined the disparate treatment in tenure and promotion decisions women journalism educators may receive because of their sex, as well as the adverse impact of such discriminatory patterns and practices on the women themselves, on their departments, and on their students. To gather information related to possible instances of discrimination in tenure and promotion, both men and women in the journalism department of a major public university, tenured and nontenured, were interviewed in depth, relevant literature was reviewed, and statistical data related to tenure were also examined. The journalism department of 21 full-time faculty members employs one tenured woman, as opposed to 12 tenured men, a situation that is consistent with campuses across the country. Findings showed a pattern of bias, misunderstanding, and insensitivity that contributes directly and indirectly to women's chances for success in higher education. The primary source of inequality seemed to be the small number of women on the typical faculty, especially considering the large number of female journalism students. Related problems included tokenism, a heavier advising load for women, lack of role models for both faculty and students who are women, and few opportunities for sharing resources and information, mentoring, networking, and coalition building. (A list of 37 references is appended.) (NKA)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED281240

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

# SHATTERING THE "GLASS CEILING" IN JOURNALISM EDUCATION: SEX DISCRIMINATION IN PROMOTION AND TENURE

Larissa Schneider Grunig
Assistant Professor
College of Journalism
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742
(301) 454-6936

Paper submitted to the Committee on the Status of Women
for presentation at the August 1987 conference of the
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication
San Antonio, Texas

CS 210477

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Larissa A. Grunig

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ABSTRACT

SHATTERING THE "GLASS CEILING" IN JOURNALISM EDUCATION:
SEX DISCRIMINATION IN PROMOTION AND TENURE

This study examines the disparate treatment in tenure and promotion decisions women may receive because of their gender. It goes on to describe the adverse impact that any discriminatory patterns and practices may have on the women themselves, on their departments and on their students. It concludes with recommendations for overcoming the special difficulties faculty women may encounter on the road to promotion or tenure because of their gender.

To gather information related to possible instances of discrimination in tenure and promotion considerations in a department of journalism, both men and women, tenured and nontenured, were interviewed in depth. Relevant theoretical and popular literature primarily from the fields of management, sociology, education, psychology and communication was reviewed. Finally, statistical data related to tenure were examined.

Findings showed few direct effects of sex discrimination on promotion and tenure. Instead, they uncovered a pattern of bias, misunderstanding and insensitivity that contributes both directly and indirectly to women's chances for success in higher education. This pattern of discrimination can haves adverse effects on both faculty men and women.

The main source of inequality seemed to be the small numbers of women on the typical faculty. Related problems included tokenism; an imbalance in gender between the faculty and journalism students; a heavier advising load for women; lack of role models for both faculty and students who are women; and few opportunities for sharing resources and information, mentoring, networking and coalition-building.

Causes of these problems included men's perceptions that women "didn't fit in," women's own feeling that they lacked power, their ineptness in negotiation, their real lack of power and support (from home as well as from the university), the realization on the part of decision-makers that women are almost "captives" of a geographical region, the burden of home responsibility that women continue to accept, the "imposter syndrome" that causes women to downplay or dismiss their accomplishments and women's insistence on working independently. Other traditional causes of discrimination against women include sex-role stereotyping, male-female interaction and social norms.

The study concludes with recommendations for enhancing the promotion and tenure picture for women and, in turn, enhancing the effectiveness of their graduates and their institutions. Crashing the "glass ceiling" that keeps faculty women from being promoted or tenured depends on hiring more women to teach, sensitizing their male colleagues about difficulties peculiar to faculty women, fostering women's risk-taking behavior, building supportive structures for women on campus and across campuses and cross-gender team-building within departments of journalism.

## Purpose of the Study

A recent letter-to-the-editor in the Chronicle of Higher Education (Tillett, 1987) decried the "deplorable status of women in terms of promotion and tenure." A page-one article in another recent issue of the Chronicle described one female sociology professor's bitter battle to win tenure at Harvard University ("Woman Who Won Tenure Fight Gets Cool Reception at Harvard," 1986). With more women faculty members now than ever before (McMillen, 1986b), this situation of women encountering special difficulties in shattering the glass ceiling of academia has major implications.

In fact, sex roles are becoming an increasingly important aspect in the study of higher education. The overall climate for campus women has been characterized as "chilly" (Sandler & Hall, 1986). Studying that entire environment, however, is beyond the scope of this paper. Instead, it will focus on sex discrimination in promotion and tenure in a department of journalism.

"Discrimination" can refer to that which is unfair, unkind, unjust, etc. This study, however, looks at instances of adverse employment practices that are related at least in part to individuals' gender. It concentrates on situations that seem to indicate the two necessary conditions for sex discrimination as it relates to promotion and tenure on college campuses: disparate treatment women receive because of their gender and the adverse

impact that these patterns and practices have on women.1

To gather information related to possible instances of discrimination in tenure and promotion, I first reviewed relevant theoretical and popular literature primarily from the fields of management, sociology, communication, education and psychology. I then examined statistical data related to tenured status at universities across the United States and within a journalism department of a major public university. (Findings, though, should have application to other departments of communication study in universities2 throughout the nation.) Finally, during the spring semester of 1986 I interviewed in depth both men and women in that department. Talking with both sexes seemed appropriate, since "discrimination" in this context implies disparate treatment of women from men in similar situations.

The following section of this paper integrates findings from the literature, the statistics and the case study to expose the problems women often encounter when working toward promotion or tenure.

## Problems

The Department of 21 full-time faculty members employs one tenured woman; 12 of the men are tenured. One woman was hired on

---

1 This definition is consistent with the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's "Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex," issued in 1980 and reprinted without revision in 1985.

2 Rohter (1987) explained that figures gathered by the American Association of University Professors show that gender disparity transcends distinctions between universities--regardless of size, source of funding or prestige.

the tenure track for the fall of 1985 and a second woman was shifted from her initial employment as instructor to assistant professor, on the tenure track, during this investigation.3 This seems surprising, given that the number of women in journalism education programs has increased substantially in the last 15 years (Sharp et al., 1985). A male full professor commented, "Only one woman has been hired on the tenure track since I've been here." In contrast, eight additional men were hired as tenured or tenure-track faculty members during those same eight years.

The dearth of female faculty members (less than one-quarter of the faculty is comprised of women) presents several problems, as does the lack of women who are tenured or who have attained the rank of full professor. This situation is consistent with campuses across the country, according to a recent report in Academe (March-April 1986, cited in Tillett, 1987). Tillett extrapolated from the data reported there to show that only 13.5 percent of tenured faculty during the 1985-86 academic year in Category I universities were women. More than 93 percent of the full professors were men; 80 percent of the tenured associate professors were men.

As a result, Rohter, an education writer for the New York Times, has called academia "a bastion of male clubbiness" (1987, p. E9). He cited figures that show the tenure rate for women at

---

3 Two additional women are listed as faculty members, but because their duties are primarily administrative they do not constitute a major focus of this study.

just below 50 percent, compared with almost 75 percent for men. As Sandler (cited in Rohter, 1987) said, "Women are still not advancing the way they should, given the number of Ph.D.'s granted." Problems inherent in the small numbers of women are described below.

Imbalance Between Female Faculty and Female Students

The relatively small number of women who are teaching in the Department studied represents an imbalance between female faculty and female students.4 This imbalance can be counterproductive for women professors. The Sharp report (1985, p. 51) explained that both male and female students are attracted to female teachers for advising since they:

> . . .automatically think that the women are going to be more sympathetic and more understanding with them and should spend more time with them than male faculty members. They are more willing to presume upon a woman's time and take up more of a woman's energy with problems than they might with a male.

Additional literature dealing specifically with female role behavior also suggests that women are expected to be more sympathetic, humanitarian and compassionate than men (White & Crino, 1981, p. 233).

Most of the eight women interviewed for this investigation alluded to overwhelming demands for time made by their

---

4 The growing number of women among undergraduate students is echoed in campuses throughout the nation, according to statistics published in the October 15, 1986, Chronicle of Higher Education: Of the total of 9,479,273 students, 53 percent were women and 47 percent were men. On September 10, 1986, the Chronicle reported that almost 51 percent of all graduate students were women.

undergraduate and graduate students. This, in turn, diminishes the time remaining for research activities that ultimately lead to promotion and tenure.

The growing majority of female students within the department also may be negatively affected by the predominance of men on the faculty. Women undergraduate and graduate students encounter too few same-sex role models and find few mentors--especially women who are powerful and well connected (the type of person who makes the most effective mentor).

Such a woman had applied to the department the previous year. When her application was turned down, after much discussion of her "disruptive" tendencies and aggressiveness, one female graduate student employed within the department lamented that "for once it would have been nice to take a class from a women." As the student pointed out, "This missed opportunity meant a full professor well thought of, with a big following, a quality person, and on top of it--she's a woman."

Recruiting

Having few tenured or tenure-track women on board may be a deterrent to female job candidates. Studies have shown that women perceive a more progressive climate in organizations that already employ a reasonable number of women (Moore, 1986, p. 6). It seems important, therefore, to examine relevant aspects of the trendy term "organizational culture."

Recent research has pointed out that organizations take on some very human characteristics (Lipton, 1986). As Lipton said:

> The concept of "corporate culture" supports this notion by reminding us that organizations are made up of people. Since these people have their own individual personalities, it is reasonable to assume that an organization represents some type of collective personality, although it certainly may not represent all the individual personalities combined. If each organization has a unique personality, it is not unreasonable to attach to it yet another human characteristic: gender (p. 164).

Of course culture and reputation of the Department are important to men as well as to women. However, these issues are especially significant for the few women who work in this male-dominated environment and for women candidates who might assess the Department's culture specifically as it relates to women. They do so in part to determine their chances for promotion and tenure in this organization.

According to Moore (1986), top management of any organization sets the tone for that organization's culture. Managers, in turn, adapt their style to that tone. Translated into the situation in the Department, this means that the dean sets the tone for the faculty group that makes decisions regarding tenure and promotion. As Moore said:

> Lip service may be paid to developing and promoting women, but if real power and influence are never given to women, then the organization is not perceived as progressive for women, and individual women's productivity and satisfaction are blocked (pp. 6-7).

This perception may have led to a lack of interest on the part of qualified women recruited for tenure-track positions within the Department. As Szafran (1982, p. 186) pointed out:

> Once traditions in organizations are established, they can shape the expectations and behavior of job applicants as well as members of the organization at all hierarchical levels even after the original conditions have changed.

Apparently both the reputation of the Department and its recruiting process deterred prospective female faculty members in the half-dozen years preceding this study. One woman interviewed during that time period recalled her experience:

> I didn't feel comfortable in the interviewing process. It was combative. I looked around and saw only one woman I could turn to for information. It was not cordial. I didn't want to work there.

Tokenism

The handful of women who do work in the Department experience special problems associated with the male-dominated faculty. These problems may affect their chances to move up within the professional hierarchy from instructor to assistant professor and on up through the tenured ranks of associate and full professor. Interview data establish the fact that problems do affect their orientation to the job and their satisfaction in teaching there.

The sole tenured female professor believes that "the only reason I've obtained tenure is because I'm a woman." She is convinced that her application came at a time when the Department needed a "token woman." She finds her position very uncomfortable. Although she does not believe that her sex, nor her research interests (related to women), will hold back her chances of promotion to full professor in the long run, she does find the going rough in the meantime.

Considering herself an outsider because of her gender, she has learned to be productive on her own. However, she feels pressured to try to be supportive to the other women on the

faculty--a heavy responsibility for the only "senior woman." And, she believes that her career could benefit from working with others on the faculty--especially those in a methodologically compatible area. Instead, though, she has found this much-needed collegiality within the women's studies program on campus, where she is quite active.

In a sense, then, this associate professor is not simply a survivor of what she believes to be an affirmative-action hiring; she is a winner at the tenure and promotion game. However, she is winning at a cost. Typical symptoms women experience when achieving high-status positions within a male-dominated organization include feelings of isolation ("I'm an outsider"), frustration, irritation and anxiety (Lipton, 1986, p. 172-73). They are candidates for coronary heart disease. They tend to smoke too much and to drink too much coffee; they exercise too little.

In essence, being a token pressures the woman who has "made it" into representing womankind. She must excel for all women. The double whammy in this situation is that such women rarely have other women with whom they can share their feelings of isolation, of not being heard or of having their ideas go unheeded (Lyles, 1985).

Hoffman (1986, p. 118) argued that the implications of this literature on tokenism and women boil down to what she called the difficulty of "applying theory to practice" in academia:

> The transformative potential of integrating the recent scholarship on women into the curriculum; of increasing the

> numbers, status, and authority of women staff and faculty on college campuses; and of challenging bureaucratic forms of domination and subordination through organized resistance to centralized authority and depersonalized control remains a vision of what could be.. . .

Others who have studied the effects on women of the numerical proportion of men to women in the workplace include Laws (1975); Kanter (1977); and Spangler, Gordon and Pipkin (1978). Their provocative analyses of tokenism describe the additional problems of typecasting and boundaries created by the majority to limit the minority's access to organizational opportunities.

Alliances

All women interviewed, including the tenured associate professor, alluded to discomfort in not having enough other women with whom to interact. Having so few women precludes important opportunities to develop mentoring relationships, networking and coalitions. Alliances, in the opinion of Conrad (1985, pp. 299-300), are critically important sources of power--especially to women. He explained:

> If employees who are outside an alliance perceive that it is stable and the combined power of its members is equal to or greater than their own, the alliance will provide its members with sizeable influence over others'actions. Alliances are informal creations and their power does threaten outsiders. And they are transient and inherently unstable creations. Yet they remain an important source of power for relatively powerless members of organizations, particularly women.

Hoffman (1986, p. 115) urged women faculty members (as well as female students) to protect their right to forge such alliances (even including amorous relationships between sexes).

She explained that "it is not in women's interests, either theoretically or practically, to concede to institutions the right to delimit the formation of personal ties among community members."

However, mentoring, networking and coalition-building are political skills that women rarely develop. Sadly, these skills are necessary for survival and particularly for advancement within an organization (Moore, 1986). Even if women in the Department were to understand power and recognize the need to build power bases and establish critical alliances, their number would be too few to be effective. These relationships must be cultivated for both career success and personal needs at work.

More specifically, women in the work force can support each other, provide role models, share information and resources, and influence organizational policies and procedures. As Bell and Young pointed out (1986, p. 47), "Together women can work to create a climate that values women and women's resources."

Mentoring

"Mentoring," or developing a close relationship with someone higher up in the organization, is an individual approach to gaining entree into the positions of power. It works.5 Research demonstrates that women with sponsors earn more at a younger age, are more satisfied with their job, and have more visibility and

---

5 One possible negative effect, though, of mentoring is that if an employee's rise within the organization is perceived as dependent on the mentor's sponsorship, then advancement may be limited (Conrad, 1985, p. 301).

more job mobility (Keele, 1986). Kanter (1977a) showed that organizational members seek others like themselves because similarity decreases uncertainty and increases communication. Another study, though, established that men rarely develop mentoring relationships with women, partly because of the difficulties inherent in cross-sexual relationships (Fitt & Newton, 1981). Another reason for the failure of mentoring to help many women is the following Catch-22: men seem unwilling to sponsor women as proteges because women have not established sufficient visibility.

So, as Williams (1985, p. 337) said, "The inner circle must decide that a person is worth coaching, and then he must be exposed on a day-to-day basis to the tasks and solutions that develop his abilities." These abilities include both the technical knowledge required for promotion on a university faculty and what Williams called the "secret know-how." He listed several reasons why women rarely are chosen by the inner circle for special grooming:

1. Men may not recognize women's potential because it is of a different kind.

2. Women may not advertise their worth.

3. Women may wait to be sought out rather than aggressively seeking a mentor.

4. Mentor relationships may be difficult to preserve on a platonic basis because the two parties may become sexually attached.

One final problem6 in a male-female mentoring relationship occurs when the woman is ready to advance. At this point, the man who is the sponsor may feel betrayed and the woman may feel guilty for putting self-interest above that of the one man who would accept her as a protege. If that happens, according to Williams (1985), she may decide to remain loyal and sacrifice her success for that of the "king bee."

In addition, the "queen bee" syndrome demonstrates that women may be unwilling to help other women by acting as their mentors. Women who have achieved high status may perceive lower-status women negatively--making them reluctant to reach out to their juniors (Rosen & Jerdee, 1973).

Networking and Coalition-Building

Networking and coalition-building go beyond mentoring, the individual approach to organizational advancement. They rely on more than one key person. As a result, these critical ingredients for tenure and promotion have been even more unobtainable for women working in the Department. As Kanter (1986, p. 108) emphasized:

> What makes people effective in organizations is the ability to create a whole set of backers and supporters, specifically for innovative activities, which helps lend the power necessary to get those activities to happen.

In other words, multiple sponsors make the real difference--not a single mentor in the long run. However, as Sandler and Hall

---

6 Conrad (1985, p. 300) pointed out that mentor-mentoree relationships like all interpersonal relationships are difficult to form and to maintain.

(1986) pointed out, faculty women find it difficult (if not impossible) to tap into their departments' informal networks. They are excluded from the trading of information, professional advice and even small talk in the hallways. Their explanation? Men often feel uncomfortable dealing with women as colleagues. Unfortunately for women, Sandler and Hall consider collegiality to be a key element for promotion in academe.

Decision Making

Of the three women who are full-time teachers in the Department, only one has been promoted to tenured status. What problems might the remaining two tenure-track appointees face because of their gender? After all, just getting hired as a woman has been demonstrated as a problem within this Department. Women encounter a hurdle not only in "getting in" but in "getting on." This section of the paper focuses on the decisions about who rises to the top.

Promotion decisions tend to be even more subjective than those related to initial hiring (Moore, 1986, p. 1). As Moore said:

> The older men who make those choices still don't feel comfortable with women. This is not considered overt discrimination; it is usually very subtle and often unconscious: those doing the choosing would never consider themselves to be discriminating against women. They are simply following their customary way of choosing people.

This, indeed, seems to be the case within the Department. In examining the record of past tenure decisions, no overt discrimination was apparent. Men and women alike were denied tenure within the last eight years. However, it remains to be

seen whether women on the tenure track now and future hires who are women will force the "glass ceiling" for women to disappear.

Interviews indicated a gloomy prediction among the women currently employed there. Most women said that as long as men remain the gatekeepers to women's entry into positions of power and security, their futures are in jeopardy. Their comments echoed the contention of Kanter (1986, p. 166) that all managers, regardless of gender, tend to be extremely protective of any source of acquired power.

People in power are willing to share their special privileges only with others whom they perceive as "fitting in." Men in particular, however, tend to reproduce themselves through subtle, unconscious promotion criteria. Moore (1986) called this "homosexual reproduction." In the Department, one might anticipate this reproduction of men in their own image when promotion criteria (as well as criteria for initial hiring) depend on backgrounds similar to their own in such areas as degree, university attended, favored methodology and research interests.

The result may be that women have more difficulty being promoted than men. As a woman approaches tenure or promotion or both, she faces a group composed almost solely of men who will review her qualifications and render the verdict. If the decision is "no," the decision might well be gender-based because of the people who are deciding. It also may be because of other problems that plague women aspiring to higher positions within their

organizations, problems that are apparent within this Department: lack of power, lack of support, the imposter syndrome, socialization and political naivete. The next sections of this study deal with each factor in turn. They also explore the interrelationships among these variables.

Power

Women lack power if they or others perceive that they lack power. This perception was a thread running throughout the interviews--conversations with men as well as with women. As Kasten (1986, p. 132) said:

> Power is a funny thing--it's primarily a matter of perception. If you have power but I don't think so, then you don't really have it. If you don't really have power but I think you do, then you do. If you have power in negotiation, you have the ability to affect favorably someone else's position. One can argue that your power depends on someone else's perception of your strength; it is what they THINK you have that matters, not what you actually have.

Also, "negotiation" is a key word in the passage quoted above. Greenhalgh and Gilkey (1986) suggested that one explanation for women's lack of power in organizations is that women tend to demand less and to concede more. Females' "hesitant, unassuming way of making a point" invite uncooperative responses from men who are looking for short-term gains. (Greenhalgh and Gilkey consider women to be more likely to work toward continuous, cooperative approaches.)

Although power may be in the eye of the beholder, faculty women often lack real power as well as perceived power. Conrad (1985, pp. 295-97) explained that one basis of power that typically eludes women is the ability to demonstrate their

"appropriateness." He said that "for a number of reasons, male professionals find it easier to create the impression that they possess the characteristics generally expected of professionals" (p. 296). He included gender as one factor that creates this perception of appropriateness (along with similar background, experiences, orientation, race, religion and marital status).

Lack of Support

In addition to lack of power, women in the Department suffer from lack of support. This lack of support can come from their home as well as from the campus, but in either case it inhibits their potential to negotiate and thus to enhance their power.

For example, women traditionally have been more committed to the career of their husband than vice versa (Landau & Amoss, 1986). Whether that remains the case for most women, or whether it is the case for the three women in the Department who are tenured or on the tenure track, is irrelevant. The important thing is that women are perceived almost as captives of their family. Any attempts they might make to win tenure or promotion through citing offers from other universities probably would not be taken so seriously as would offers cited by men in similar bargaining situations.

However, research also shows that family concerns are very real inhibitors for women. They continue to do more than their share of the home maintenance activities in addition to pursuing careers and advancing within their field (Heins et al., 1976). Kahn-Hut, Daniels and Coward (1982, p. 38) described one special

problem that professional women, such as college professors, may face:

> Professional ideologies depict such work as "a calling" that requires round-the-clock devotion to work. This devotion is a primary allegiance that conflicts with the cultural mandate of women's primary responsibility to family.. . .

Although employers and colleagues cannot be held accountable for these extraneous factors that may reduce women's ability to compete for promotions and tenure, men on the faculty and in administration must recognize them as sources of stress, conflict and exhaustion for women.

The "Imposter" Syndrome

Women themselves often inhibit their own chances for advancement. The "imposter" syndrome is apparent on the faculty studied. The imposter response is evident in women who doubt their competence. Such downplaying or dismissing of their accomplishments often stymies women in their careers (Bell & Young, 1986). It comes from women having to compete in a work world dominated by men. As one consultant (cited in Bell & Young, 1986, p. 29) said:

> The system. . .was designed by men and according to male values, so in a real sense we are fakes because the system was not designed for us. Not having a history of belonging makes one feel like an imposter.

Women's self-doubts are augmented by devaluation by their male colleagues on this faculty. When men exclude women from groups going to lunch or chatting in the halls, they foster insecurity. When men cast aspersions on women's degrees, such as English or American Studies, they reinforce women's perceptions

that they are not valuable people within the Department. Throughout the interviews, the attitudes and behaviors of individual men were constantly cited by women as factors in their own feelings of self-worth related to the advancement process. Such attitudes and behaviors include exclusions, interruptions, stereotyping, paternalism and trivialization of women's concerns and proposals.

To counteract these messages that reinforce negative self-images, the women on this faculty feel they have tried harder than the men. They believe that they must be more competent than men in order to be successful in the Department. Further, they feel they must "go it alone," achieving independently rather than relying on others--men or women--for help. Bell and Young (1986, p. 32) emphasized the unfortunate side-effects of such a reaction:

> Their sense of what is required to be judged competent may not be exaggerated at all but rather may be a realistic assessment of what women must do to achieve status in a male-dominated world. However realistic this assessment may be, perfectionism can and does interfere with women's ability to delegate effectively or otherwise carry out the mandates of their job.

Women experience distress when they feel like impostors, but the organization also suffers. The list of instances, many of which the Department has experienced, is lengthy. It includes the fact that women are less likely to vie for advancement, as when a woman formerly tenured settles for an instructorship in the Department. Women may be reticent to offer potentially valuable insights for fear of being ignored, ridiculed or considered wrong

or incompetent, as when they keep silent during faculty or committee meetings. They are less likely to take risks from which the organization could gain; and they are less able to make use of constructive criticism, from which they could gain. Finally, as Bell and Young (1986, p. 48) pointed out, women are "more susceptible to psychological and physiological stress caused by the anxiety of waiting to be found out."

Socialization

Socialization is a problem related to imposterism. This major barrier facing women includes aspects of sex-role stereotyping, male-female interaction patterns and societal norms (Lyles, 1986).

Sex-role stereotypes, according to Terborg (1977, p. 650), are:

> . . .the widely held beliefs concerning appropriate male and female behavior. For example, it might be acceptable for a male supervisor to verbally chastise a subordinate whereas the same behavior by a woman supervisor may be perceived as out of role and unacceptable.

Attaching these consensual beliefs about characteristics that differentiate men from women to expected behaviors pigeonhole people. One female stereotype, in particular, is damning for women on the tenure track: passivity. Men who perceive women as passive relegate them to jobs that are routine. When those men serve on promotion and tenure committees, they are not inclined to advance women. Women who perceive themselves as passive are unlikely to aspire to rise about their current status in the academic hierarchy (Davies, 1974, p. 16).

Hoffman (1986, p. 108) considered the authority of men over women to be "inextricably interwoven" with sexual stereotyping. She explained:

> Bureaucratic forms of decisionmaking and control (nonparticipatory, nondemocratic, and hierarchical) reinforce and are reinforced by status differences between men and women and by culturally prescribed patterns of male and female authority.

She argued (p. 115) that women must challenge the causes of their disadvantaged status, primarily by challenging those assumptions of power, privilege and stereotype. Until both men and women on the faculty become aware of the limitations imposed by socialization, women's chances for promotion and tenure are jeopardized. The alienation and undemocratic working conditions for women will persist.

Political naivete

Political naivete is a final barrier to any organization's political system or network--which in the case of the Department is composed overwhelmingly of men. Women interviewed complain that without access to powerful coalitions or knowledge of the Department's political climate, they are at a disadvantage when it comes to promotion and tenure.

Being out of the mainstream may even be a disadvantage during the recruiting and hiring stage of employment. One woman reported that she had been teaching in an adjunct role when the one tenured woman on the faculty apprised her of a vacancy on the faculty and urged her to apply for that full-time slot. Only in this way did she hear of the opening. However, she was not

offered a tenure-track position although she had been tenured on an English faculty in the past. Thus, the Department risked another opportunity to include a tenurable woman within its ranks.7

## Summary

This investigation discovered few direct effects of sex discrimination on promotion and tenure within the Department. Instead, it uncovered a pattern of bias, misunderstanding and insensitivity that contributes both directly and indirectly to women's chances for success there.

This pattern and the practices of men in positions of power are not limited to the Department, of course; as the University's director of institutional studies pointed out, "Women on this campus are in the lower ranks." She considered the problem a serious one across campus. Tenured, full-time faculty in all divisions of the campus are predominately male: 882 of the full and associate professors ar men, compared with the 144 who are women. The ratio is somewhat more favorable to women within the Department's division, where 53 of the 227 full and associate professors are female.

Still, women on this faculty encounter nonintentional discrimination patterns at work. They are not automatically part of the organization's informational and decisional networks. As such, they perceive bias. If a group's numbers are small, such as

---

7 The woman has since been promoted to the tenure track as an assistant professor.

the female faculty, it will not have nor will it perceive that it has power in decision-making even though individuals in that group are ostensibly involved. Further, women do not have a clear idea of successful career strategies that they would glean from role models or mentors. They face attitudinal barriers of their own and men's creation at work and at home. They lack the time, the experience, the financial and emotional support, the networks and the coalitions often necessary to conduct many activities that they are convinced would help pave the way toward advancement within the Department.

Of course, men face many of these same problems. Are woman on the faculty really any different? For one thing, there are fewer of them available to climb the ladder toward full professorship. As a result, the growing but still limited field of women with PhDs and professional experience must be cultivated in special ways if faculties and students are to benefit from the contributions that women make.8

Several interviewees in the Department--men and women alike --contended that studying the "women's problem" actually will make life tougher for women on the faculty. They believe such research is myth-promoting and self-serving. They fear it will

---

8 In 1959, Mills distinguished between what he called "private troubles" and "public issues." The former occur when isolated events cause trouble for individuals. The latter are structurally induced problems that affect large numbers of individuals in particular groups, such as women. Thus a man rejected for tenure experiences a private trouble, whereas women's battles to shatter the glass ceiling in academia have become public issues not amenable to individual solutions.

make it more difficult for women to be promoted and even to hang onto their current jobs.

Men, in particular, said that women are relying on the myth that their row is harder to hoe than men's as an excuse for lack of productivity or achievement and that professionals "take care of business," doing research and publishing, rather than bemoaning a chromosomal accident. Other men claimed that women's chances for promotion and tenure will be greater when they have been in the field longer: it's just a matter of time.

The fact remains, though, that this faculty employs only one tenured woman and two on the tenure track. The culture of the faculty has been determined in large part, then, by men. That culture, however benign in intention, is not conducive to success by women. And unfortunately, because of the long history of this situation, the inertia is a formidable barrier to overcome. As Hoffman said (1986, p. 116), "the foundation of gender inequality is very strong."

Denial by some men and by some women that a problem exists specifically for women reinforces that barrier. Thus although change seems inevitable, significant change within a short period of time will be difficult to accomplish. Unfortunately, time is a luxury that universities can ill afford because of the potential for damage to women currently on their faculties and because of the demands of their marketplace: the students.

## Solutions

Investigating perceptions and instances of discrimination

against women in this case study suggests its solution. Rather than blaming either the agents of this bias or its victims, the faculties and administrators should take positive and immediate steps to overcome the problems that affect them adversely. Reactions to the suggestions that follow may take one of three main forms.

First, the faculty may **RESIST** the recommendations. Faculty members may cite such factors as reverse discrimination, mere perception of a problem or the alienation inherent in focusing attention on one group over another. Second, they may **ACCOMMODATE** the women on the faculty. This means that they may pay lip service to the notion of equality of the sexes. They may even agree to adopt part of the list of recommendations. However, whatever changes are made will be made grudgingly because men feel they are forced into a socially acceptable posture of fairness. They may even fear legal action or provisional accreditation of their program. In essence, accommodation is merely a more subtle form of resistance (Moore, 1986).

Third, and ideally, men and women alike will agree that although many difficulties women face need more research and analysis, a real problem does exist for campus women. As a result, they will genuinely try to **SOLVE** the problems exposed in this case study. As Moore (1986, p. 10) said:

> Organizations and their managers need to understand that developing programs that go beyond token responses is, in the long run, less expensive than potential lawsuits and the waste of underutilized talent.

No easy solutions present themselves to the problem of

tenure and promotion for women. The barriers women face are both internal and external. And, despite more than a decade of affirmative action, women still encounter a myriad obstacles to advancement within almost any organization.

Many of these difficulties are interrelated; but in the next section of this study, problems are separated out and countered with recommendations for their solution. Recommended policies are targeted toward the Department under investigation, but not so narrowly that they lack application to faculties across disciplines and across universities.

Hiring More Women

Hiring more women would go a long way toward solving the problems women experience related to promotion and tenure, particularly if the recruits are in positions of authority. One expectation, cited in the research literature, is that increased numbers of women will cause prejudice to disappear (Moore, 1986).

Countering this notion, however, is the contention that resistance to promoting and even hiring women increases with numbers of women employed (past an initial 15 percent). At that point, according to Harlan (1985, p. 164), men seem to say, "Hey, they're all over the place, and they may get the next job I want." Resistance then becomes overt for a reason that is largely subconscious--fear that women will threaten a man's promotion.

Still, increasing the number of faculty women--especially tenure-track and full professor positions--would enhance both the real power of women and their ability to participate in decision

making. That way, although inequities still might exist, the inequities would be the responsibility of both men and women rather than just men. Hiring more women also would release the one tenured woman from her burden as the "token." She would have more colleagues with whom to interact on her own level and the remaining, more junior women would have choices of mentors available for the critically important access to organizational information and political strategies.

Education

Recognizing the problems women encounter in their trip up the ladder toward tenure and becoming full professors goes a long way toward alleviating those difficulties. Sensitizing or educating men about difficulties peculiar to women involves asking the following probing and relevant queries:

* Are organizational norms applied differently to women and men?

* Are women who toot their own horns perceived less favorably than are men who do so?

* Does the faculty recognize and address the uniqueness of women's experience as it relates to achievement? In particular, does it appreciate the increased scrutiny and isolation that advancement causes women in the organization?

* Does the faculty appreciate the factors, both societal and organizational, that create and reinforce women's self doubts? In particular, does it understand the limitations inherent in others' assumptions about women's abilities, appropriate roles

for females, the different kinds and amounts of feedback women receive from the dean, women's status as outsiders, the discounting behaviors and attitudes of individual men on the faculty, the pressures on a single woman to represent her entire gender group, the relentless pressure on women to prove their competence, and the expectations that women excel in the role of superwoman: academic, wife and mother?

* Are women shielded from taking risks?

Fostering risk-taking behavior would go a long way toward empowering the victims and potential victims of sex discrimination. Giving women autonomy over decisions that directly affect their careers would build their self-confidence and emphasize that competence usually is a function of acquired skills rather than innate ability. In so doing, it would demystify competence and explore stereotypical assumptions about female ability, aspirations and roles. It also might assess the competence of others, thus reinforcing women's self-confidence. It would make supervisors aware of the internal and external barriers that undermine women's potential for advancement. As Bell and Young (1986, p. 50) said:

> We are all entitled to succeed, fail, test our competence, and grow. The more we affirm this for ourselves and others, the less potent imposter feelings become. The best antidote to imposterism may be authenticity--both individual and organizational.

Support

Support structures for women must be built into the faculty. No one need feel, as many do now, that they do not belong in

their Department. Strong-tie relationships are especially important for women, since research indicates that they need such ties to balance the lack of stability and power that their positions typically offer (Keele, 1986). Expanding women's networks beyond the limitations of any single department is one way to accomplish this necessary interaction.

Although intradepartmental committees and social activities provide two means by which women can interact with colleagues, women also need to communicate verbally and symbolically with women in other universities. Allocating travel funds for such purposes supports the efforts of women to connect with others who are like them. And, in addition to meeting faculty women elsewhere, women sent to professional conferences such as AEJMC, ICA, SCA and PRSA offer the bonus of opportunity for organizational innovation and visibility.

These mobile women are the kind of people Kanter (1986) called "change masters," or the managers of the future organization. She emphasized that certain environments foster change, while others retard the innovation that most organizations--including universities--will discover is vital to their survival in the 1990s.

Other aspects of the organization, in addition to providing support for travel and interaction with peers at other institutions, foster the development of change masters. They include the "culture of pride," one that considers all employees winners who are valued as talented, creative achievers regardless

of sex (or degree or institution attended or research methodology). They also provide information as a necessary resource--encouraging people to communicate across lines of the hierarchy such as junior versus senior faculty, or associate versus full professor, or faculty versus administration. For example, supportive information provides unsolicited information about forthcoming meetings, appointments, vacancies, social activities and even informal norms and coalitions. As it is now, women on the Department's faculty believe that they miss out because they are excluded--either intentionally or unintentionally--from lunch and other informal occasions.

Integration

"Integration" means people pulling together rather than pulling apart. When faculties are not divided along rigid divisions of gender or status, there is a sense of teamwork. What becomes important is getting things done, not who does them. Making the Department less category-conscious (whether the category is gender- or academic rank-based) would encourage people to reach beyond the givens of their job to do more for the good of the whole.

Segmentation or stratification, in contrast, encourages "microscopic thinking: detail-conscious, oriented toward specialties, oriented toward the status quo" (Kanter, 1986, p. 194). Too many interviewees indicated competition between subject specialties and a zero-sum game where some faculty members manage to advance at the perceived expense of others. Colleagues seemed

to forget, in their competition, that the WHOLE Department has to survive and, ideally, to flourish.

**Conclusions**

Change seems inevitable. Taylor, in his Rethink, argued that society is swinging inexorably toward matrism and rejecting the patrism of the past. He characterized "patrism" as believing in order and discipline, trying to maintain the traditions of the past, distinguishing male and female roles, and putting more faith in experience and age than in youth. "Matrism," on the other hand, emphasizes the future, believes in openness and emotions, makes little distinction between the sexes, pushes for discussion rather than orders, relies on expertise rather than experience, and values youth and imagination over age. Other scholars have concluded that if society does not embrace matrism, employees who find the current system alienating will find their own weapons with which to subvert the system (cited in Langer, 1985).

Rather than either socializing women into the male model or having them dominate their male counterparts on campus, both sexes might learn from each other about competition and cooperation, domination and yielding, independence and dependence. One might ask, though, why men should consider such seemingly radical acquiesence when they hold most of the marbles right now?

For starters, it's the right thing to do. In addition to morality, though, there are many positive (even self-serving)

reasons for men to accept women on equal terms. Too many affirmative action plans of the past have been based on threats rather than on the potential benefits of promoting or tenuring women--threats such as jeopardizing accreditation, suffering a poor reputation as an academic unit or as a university or even being sued. Instead, men might be interested to discover how women's interests can enrich their own.

To begin with, market research indicates that it's helpful to have the viewpoint of more than half of all the consumers--the students--represented among the ranks. (Women in the Department studied constitute about two-thirds of its student enrollment.) The marketplace, especially for the brightest undergraduates and graduate students, is increasingly competitive. Having more women on the faculty should give institutions the edge in recruiting and retaining good students as well as good colleagues.

Of course, campuses that want to hire and retain qualified women and use those women to their fullest potential will have to encourage them in all functions and at all levels. This might mean pressing for promotion of associate professors as soon as possible to full professor and of early tenure for assistant professors. Such practice is already common in some departments of the university studied, according to a representative of the divisional tenure committee. He cited instances where faculties united behind candidates they chose to push for early promotion. In the process, such faculties became even more integrated internally. They make the case that their proteges are qualified

for tenure at this point in time, rather than at some fixed, arbitrary point, because of actual achievement. They emphasize fairness rather than time in grade. Building such a case unites the faculty behind its candidates, and the ensuing collegiality is more vital than one born of social occasions or other informal interactions. Then too, chosen candidates **DO** qualify for early promotion and tenure because they have been nurtured by their faculties since the initial commitment to hire them.

Because the educational business is becoming more competitive, employing people capable of and motivated to do their part and more seems especially crucial. In fact, accomplishing the challenges set forth in many campuses' long-range plans requires above-and-beyond efforts on the part of the entire faculty. They do not want to lose their momentum or --worse yet--incur lawsuits or the waste of underused ability. As Hubert H. Humphrey (1980) said, "One of the richest underutilized resources in America is the talents of its women."

As a first step toward implementing the recommendations set forth in this study, individuals on faculties and administrations must ask to what extent they **WANT** women to overcome the barriers they perceive toward promotion and tenure. Are they really interested in helping? If not, ask what the consequence of not helping might be. For example, what might happen if one of the women gains power over one of the men down the road a piece?

Next, individuals should recognize the long-term costs and benefits associated with including women and capitalizing on

their skills and other, personal contributions. There are intrinsic rewards, such as feeling good about helping others. There is the conservation of the faculty's human resources via cohesive work groups, selflessness and high performance on the part of highly qualified individuals.

Although increased attention to the problems of faculty women in journalism undoubtedly costs men some comfort in the short run, the problems will not go away by ignoring them. Instead, hoping the situation will somehow evaporate will only lead to missed opportunities, high levels of stress on the part of both women and men and poor overall performance of the academic unit. Only by understanding the special difficulties women face and acting decisively to combat them will women--along with their male colleagues, their universities and their students--prosper.

**SELECTED REFERENCES**

Bell, L., and V. Young. "Imposters, Fakes, and Frauds," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 25-52.

Conrad, C. Strategic Organizational Communication: Cultures, Situations, and Adaptation (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1985).

Davies, M. "Women's Place Is at the Typewriter: The Feminization of the Clerical Work Force." Radical America 8(4) (July-August 1974): 1-28.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission."Guidelines on Discrimination Because of Sex." (1 July 1985 Code of Federal Regulations).

Fitt, L.W., and D.A. Newton. "When the Mentor Is a Man and the Protegee a Woman." Harvard Business Review 59(2) (March-April 1981): 56-60.

Greenhalgh, L., and R.W. Gilkey. "Our Game, Your Rules: Developing Effective Negotiating Approaches," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 135-48.

Harlan, A. (cited in G. Collins, "Unforeseen Business Barriers for Women") in B.A. Stead (ed.), Women in Management, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985), pp. 161-64.

Heins, M., S. Smock, J. Jacobs, and M. Stein. "Productivity of Women Physicians." Journal of the American Medical Association 236 (1976): 1961-1964.

Hoffman, F.L. "Sexual Harassment in Academia: Feminist Theory and Institutional Practice." Harvard Educational Review 56(2) (May 1986): 105-21.

Humphrey, H.H. (as quoted by J.J. Famularo, "Women at the Top: The Record, the Obstacles, the Outlook." California Management Review 23[1] [August 1967]: 53-63).

Kahn-Hut, R., A.K. Daniels, and R. Coward. Women and Work: Problems and Perspectives (New York: Oxford University Press, 1982).

Kanter, R.M. Men and Women of the Corporation (New York: Basic Books, 1977a).

Kanter, R.M. "Some Effects of Proportion on Group Life: Skewed Sex Ratios and Responses to Token Women." American Journal of Sociology 82 (1977b): 965-90.

Kanter, R.M. "Mastering Change: The Skills We Need," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp 181-94.

Kasten, B.R. "Separate Strengths: How Men and Women Manage Conflict and Competition," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 121-34.

Keele, R. "Mentoring or Networking? Strong and Weak Ties in Career Development," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 53-68.

Landau, J., and L. Amoss. "Myths, Dreams, and Disappointments: Preparing Women for the Future," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 13-24.

Langer, J. "A Typology of Working Women," in B.A. Stead (ed.),

Women in Management, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985), pp. 3-8.

Laws, J.L. "The Psychology of Tokenism: An Analysis." Sex Roles 1 (1975): 51-67.

Lipton, M. "Successful Women in a Man's World: The Myth of Managerial Androgyny," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 163-80.

Lyles, M.A. "Strategies for Helping Women Managers--Or Anyone," in B.A. Stead (ed.), Women in Management, 2nd ed. (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1985), pp. 16-27.

McMillen, L. "A 'Chilly Climate' Is Reported for Women on the Campuses." Chronicle of Higher Education (Dec. 3, 1986): 16.

McMillen, L. "Women's Groups: Going the Old Boys' Network One Better." Chronicle of Higher Education (Dec. 3, 1986): 15-17.

Mills, C.W. The Sociological Imagination (New York: Grove Press, 1959).

Moore, L.L. "Introduction," in L.L. Moore (ed.), Not as Far as You Think (Lexington, MA: Lexington Books, 1986), pp. 1-12.

Rohter, L. "Women Gain Degrees, but Not Tenure." New York Times (Jan. 4, 1987): E9.

Rosen, B., and T.H. Jerdee. "The Influence of Sex-Role Stereotypes on Evaluations of Male and Female Supervisory Behavior." Journal of Applied Psychology 57 (1973): 44-48.

Sandler, B.R., and R. Hall. The Campus Climate Revisited: Chilly for Women Faculty, Administrators, and Graduate Students (Washington, DC: Project on the Status and Education of Women, 1986).

Sharp, N.W., J.V. Turk, E.F. Einsiedel, L. Schamber, and S. Hollenback. Faculty Women in Journalism and Mass Communications: Problems and Progress (Syracuse, NY: Gannett Foundation, 1985).

Spangler, E., M. Gordon, and R. Pipkin. "Token Women: An Empirical Test of Kanter's Hypothesis." American Journal of Sociology 84 (1978): 160-70.

Szafran, R.F. "What Kinds of Firms Hire and Promote Women and Blacks?" The Sociological Quarterly 23 (Spring 1982): 171-90.

Terborg, J.R. "Women in Management: A Research Review." Journal of Applied Psychology 62 (1977): 647-64.

Tillett, J. "Letter to the Editor." Chronicle of Higher Education (Jan. 14, 1987): 49.

United States Equal Employment Opportunities Commission. Basic Compliance: Theories of Discrimination (Workbook).

White, M.C., and M.D. Crino. "A Critical Review of Female Performance, Performance Training and Organizational Initiatives Designed to Aid Women in the Work-Role Environment." Personnel Psychology 34(2) (Summer 1981): 227-45.

Williams, M. "Women and Success in Organizations," in M. Gerrard, J. Oliver, and M. Williams (eds.), Women in Management Proceedings of the Conference, Women and Men--Colleagues in Management? (Austin, TX: Center for Social Work Research, The University of Texas at Austin, 1976).

"Woman Who Won Tenure Fight Gets Cool Reception at Harvard." Chronicle of Higher Education (Oct. 1, 1986): 1.